



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,204	09/18/2000	Nathan F. Raciborski	19396-000200US	4087

7590 01/30/2004

Thomas D Franklin
Townsend and Townsend and Crew LLP
Two Embarcadero Center 8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

BAUGH, APRIL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/665,204

Applicant(s)

RACIBORSKI ET AL.

Examiner

April L Baugh

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 6-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 6-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 September 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2-4 & 6-10 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims ~~7~~, 7-10, 14-16, and 19-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by US Patent No. 6,175, 869 to Ahuja et al.

Regarding claim 7, Ahuja et al. teaches a system for distributing content to a client computer (column 1, lines 5-10), comprising: a content object (column 1, lines 25-27); a first content cache at a first address, wherein the first content cache comprises a first copy of the content object; a second content cache at a second address, wherein the second content cache comprises a second copy of the content object (column 4, lines 31-36 and fig. 3a); and a directory that maps one of the first copy, and the second copy to the client computer (column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 20).

Regarding claim 14, Ahuja et al. teaches a system for distributing content to a client computer (column 1, lines 5-10), comprising: a content object comprising a portion (column 1, lines 25-27 and column 3, lines 61-64); a first content cache at a first address, wherein the first content cache comprises a first copy of the portion; a second content cache at a second address,

Art Unit: 2141

wherein the second content cache comprises a second copy of the portion (column 4, lines 31-36 and fig. 3a); and a routing mechanism that maps one of the portion, the first copy, and the second copy to the client computer (column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 20).

Referring to claim 2 and 10, Ahuja et al. teaches the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claim 1 and 7, further comprising a routing mechanism that maps one of the content object, the first copy and the second copy to the client computer (column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 20).

Referring to claim 8 and 15, Ahuja et al. teaches the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claim 7 and 14, further comprising a preference list originating from the client computer, wherein the preference list comprises at least one of the first address and the second address (column 2, lines 21-28).

Referring to claim 9 and 16, Ahuja et al. teaches the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claim 8 and 15, wherein the directory is affected by the preference list (column 2, lines 21-28 and column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 20).

Regarding claim 19, Ahuja et al. teaches the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claim 16, wherein: the content object comprises a first portion and a second portion; the first portion is stored on the first content cache and not on the second content cache; and the second portion is stored on the second content cache and not on the first content cache (column 3, lines 61-64 and column 4, lines 31-36 and fig. 3a).

Regarding claim 20, Ahuja et al. teaches the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claims 14, wherein the routing mechanism includes a directory (column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 11-13, and 17-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,175, 869 to Ahuja et al. in view of Lindbo et al.

Regarding claim 1, Ahuja et al. teaches a system for distributing content to a client computer (column 1, lines 5-10), comprising: a first content cache at a first address, wherein the first content cache comprises a first copy of the content object; a second content cache at a second address, wherein the second content cache comprises a second copy of the content object (column 4, lines 31-36 and fig. 3a); a preference list originating from the client computer, wherein the preference list comprises at least one of the first address and the second address (column 2, lines 21-28); and a directory that maps at least one of the content object, the first copy, and the second copy to the client computer, wherein the directory is affected by the preference list (column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 20).

Ahuja et al. does not teach a server comprising a content object. Lindbo et al. teaches a server comprising a content object (column 2, lines 35-41 and fig.3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the content distribution network of Ahuja et al. by having server comprising a content

Art Unit: 2141

object because the replicated content (object) in the content caches must come from an original source server (content server).

Referring to claim 11 and 17, Ahuja et al. teaches the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claim 7 and 14 (column 1, lines 5-10).

Ahuja et al. does not teach a server comprising a content object.. Lindbo et al. teaches a server comprising a content object (column 2, lines 35-41 and fig.3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the content distribution network of Ahuja et al. by having server comprising a content object because the replicated content (object) in the content caches must come from an original source server (content server).

Referring to claim 2, Ahuja et al. teaches the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claim 1, further comprising a routing mechanism that maps one of the content object, the first copy and the second copy to the client computer (column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 20).

Regarding claim 4 and 12 and 18, Ahuja et al. teaches the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claim 1 and 11 and 17, wherein the server periodically delivers a catalog of content objects to the directory (column 2, lines 21-28).

Regarding claim 6 and 13, Ahuja et al. teaches the system for distributing content to the client computer as recited in claim 1 and 11, wherein: the content object comprises a first portion and a second portion; the first portion is stored on the first content cache and not on the second content cache; and the second portion is stored on the second content cache and not on the first content cache (column 3, lines 61-64 and column 4, lines 31-36 and fig. 3a).

Art Unit: 2141

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to content distribution networks in general:

US Patent No. 6,345,303 to Knauerhase et al.

US Patent No. 6,311,216 to Smith et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April L Baugh whose telephone number is 703-305-5317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal D Dharia can be reached on 703-305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

ALB


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPPLEMENTARY PATENT EXAMINER